

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

JASON DODD,

Plaintiff,

v.

SAFECO INSURANCE COMPANY
OF AMERICA,

Defendant.

Case No. CIV-19-00701-JD

ORDER

Before the Court is the Motion to Compel [Doc. No. 25] filed by Plaintiff Jason Dodd (“Motion”). The parties have also filed briefing on the issue of the construction of the “carry-over balances from previous loans or leases” provision contained in the Auto Loan/Lease Coverage section of the insurance policy at issue in this case. [Doc. Nos. 69, 72–73, 81, and 83]. The parties appear to agree that the resolution of the legal question at issue in [Doc. Nos. 69, 72–73, 81, and 83] will impact the resolution of the Motion. *See, e.g.*, [Doc. No. 66]. The Court previously agreed with the parties that resolution of the policy construction issue “will resolve a substantial number of issues in this case, and should resolve the pending [Motion].” [Doc. No. 68].

The Court has inherent authority to manage its docket “so as to achieve the orderly” disposition of cases. *Link v. Wabash R.R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 630–31 (1962). In managing its dockets, the Court has determined that events after the filing of the Motion have rendered the Motion premature. A more orderly disposition of this case is for the Court to rule on the legal question at issue in [Doc. Nos. 69, 72–73, 81, and 83] and then

resolve discovery issues that result, if any, with an updated set of briefs that take in to account all of the Court's rulings and the parties' positions.

Accordingly, the Motion [Doc. No. 25] is STRICKEN without prejudice to refiling at the appropriate time, if necessary, after the Court rules on the legal question at issue in [Doc. Nos. 69, 72–73, 81, and 83].¹

IT IS SO ORDERED this 31st day of August 2021.



JODI W. DISHMAN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ This Order in no way foreshadows any ruling on the legal question at issue in [Doc. Nos. 69, 72–73, 81, and 83]; this is merely a docket-management tool that the Court has concluded will result in a more orderly disposition of this case. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 1; *Link v. Wabash R.R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 630–31 (1962). *See also* [Doc. No. 68].